

# JURISDICTION: FDA OR EPA ?

- GE Animals
- Products for  
Livestock, Pets,  
and Wildlife

April 2021

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

1

# Purpose of Briefing

- Describe the history and challenges of EPA-FDA jurisdiction
- Describe the 2 product types at issue:
  - GE insects/animals for population control
  - Chemical parasite control products for domestic animals
- Describe staff's 3 possible approaches to resolve jurisdictional impasse

# Background

- Until 1975, products intended to kill “pest” animals met both the FIFRA definition of pesticide and FFDCA definition of drug.
- In 1975, Congress amended the FIFRA pesticide definition to specifically exclude new animal drugs as defined by FFDCA:
  - “articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals.”
- Effectuating adequate oversight has become increasingly difficult under paradigm established by 1975 amendment to FIFRA.
  - A series of MOUs have been proposed since 1975 (most recently 2010) but never finalized.
  - Identified need to provide adequate protection for:
    - The environment when animals are GE for population control (i.e., those similar to the GE mosquito) (e.g., GE ticks and mice) that FIFRA can provide.
    - Domestic animals (pets and livestock) whose welfare is not adequately accounted for when registering chemical parasite control products.

## Background:

### Jurisdiction Transfer of GE Animals for Population Control from FDA to EPA

Year	Action
2009	FDA publishes Guidance for Industry #187 and asserts jurisdiction over all GE animals
2016	US National Biotechnology Strategy set forth goal of realigning oversight with traditional regulatory authorities so that genetically engineered insects for population control would be regulated by EPA and USDA
2017	<p>Impacted by concern over Zika virus transmission and infant encephalitis, FDA makes some progress towards 2016 USG goal and publishes Guidance for Industry #236 which moves GE mosquitoes for population control from FDA to EPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EPA believes that rationale allowing transfer of mosquito products from FDA to EPA jurisdiction applies equally well to all other GE animals for population control</li><li>• FDA expresses to EPA concern about potential impact on FDA's purview and potential unanticipated effects on past jurisdictional decisions for chemical products</li></ul>
2020	EPA regulates Oxitec GE mosquito and issues experimental use permit in April 2020

## Current Issues:

### Jurisdiction Transfer of GE Animals for Population Control from FDA to EPA

- These genetically engineered animals can have broad environmental consequences, e.g., gene drives can significantly suppress or even eradicate species. Only EPA under FIFRA has broad enough authorities to address
- Although FDA issued #236, in 2020 FDA sent revised draft Guidance for Industry #187 to OMB, but did not share with EPA, and we have heard that it does not address EPA concerns on other GE animals for population control

## Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

# Chemical Animal Products:

Challenges with Current Paradigm

## **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

6

# Chemical Animal Products: EPA to FDA

## Current and Proposed Jurisdiction

### EPA (Current)

- o Pet and livestock products (spot-ons, collars, shampoos, sprays, dips, etc.) applied to exterior of animals that are **'not systemic'**
- o Products to kill parasites in unoccupied fish hatcheries, waterbodies, etc.
- o Insecticides for livestock and pet premises (not attached to host)
- o Lethal products for wildlife species (including feral cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Contraceptives for wildlife species (including feral cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Solid or liquid feed-through insect growth regulators (IGRs) that are part of feed rations or free-choice feed

### Proposed

#### Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

### FDA (Current)

- o Pet and livestock products (spot-ons, collars, shampoos, sprays, dips, etc.) applied to exterior of animals that are **'systemic'**
- o Products to treat parasites/disease on live aquatic organisms
- o Internal drugs for pets and livestock
- o Euthanasia products for domestic animals (including livestock and domestic cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Contraceptives for domestic animals (including domestic cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Solid or liquid drugs that are part of feed rations or free-choice medicated feed

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

7

FIFRA is location-based statute.

#### Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

### Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Draft Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

# Chemical Animal Products: EPA to FDA

## Current FDA Staff Opinions

### **EPA** (Current)

- o Pet and livestock products (spot-ons, collars, shampoos, sprays, dips, etc.) applied to exterior of animals that are **'not systemic'**
- o Products to kill parasites in unoccupied fish hatcheries, waterbodies, etc.
- o Insecticides for livestock and pet premises (not attached to host)
- o Lethal products for wildlife species (including feral cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Contraceptives for wildlife species (including feral cats, dogs, and horses)
- o Solid or liquid feed-through insect growth regulators (IGRs) that are part of feed rations or free-choice feed

## **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

8



Opportunities

## **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

9

Path Forward:  
GE and Chemical Animal Products

## **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Deliberative – Do Not Distribute

10